Appendix J requires ILRTs to be performed at approximately equal intervals during each 10-year service period. The third test of each set must be conducted when the plant is shut down for the 10-year plant inservice inspections. In order to schedule the next ILRT (the third ILRT of this service period) such that it coincides with the 10-year inservice inspections, the licensee has requested a one-time exemption from the Appendix J requirements. The exemption would extend the 10-year service period by one refueling outage to permit the licensee to perform the next ILRT together with the 10-year inservice inspection that are scheduled during the thirteenth refueling outage in 1996.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated November 8, 1994.

*The Need for the Proposed Action*

If performed during the thirteenth refueling outage, the third ILRT will not be completed until after the end of the current 10-year service period. To comply with regulations as written, an ILRT would be required during the twelfth refueling outage in 1995 to satisfy the requirement for three ILRT's during the 10-year service period and another ILRT would be required during the thirteenth refueling outage in 1996 to satisfy the requirement for the third ILRT to be performed when the plant is shut down for the 10-year inservice inspection. Without the requested exemption and related technical specification changes, the licensee would be required to perform ILRT's during both the twelfth and thirteenth refueling outages. A requirement to perform ILRT's during two consecutive refuelings is clearly beyond the intent of the regulations and given the satisfactory results of previous tests at ANO–1, there is little, if anything, to gain from two closely spaced tests.

*Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that granting of the one-time relief does not impact the environment. Six previous ILRT's performed at approximately three year intervals have not identified containment leakage concerns. An interval extension of one refueling outage (approximately 18 months) between the sixth and seventh ILRT is not likely to result in unidentified containment leakage during plant operations. There is minimal concern that the ILRT interval extension would increase the release of radioactive materials during normal operations or after an accident.

The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

*Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative to the action would be to deny the request. Such action would not significantly reduce the environmental impact of plant operation and would result in lost electrical generation capacity and other expenses to the licensee.

*Alternative Use of Resources*

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 1.

*Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, the staff consulted with the State of Arkansas regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

**Finding of No Significant Impact**

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated November 8, 1994, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, Arkansas 72801.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of January 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**George Kalman,**

*Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate IV–1, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 95–2575 Filed 2–1–95; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590–01–M**

## Notice of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Correction

This notice corrects the notice issued in the Bi-Weekly Notices of Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Consideration for Illinois Power Company and Soyland Power Cooperative, Inc., on November 23, 1994 (59 FR 60392). The correct notice follows as Amendment No. 94 issued and effective on November 3, 1994:

The amendment modifies Technical Specification (TS) 3/4.3.1, ''Reactor Protection System Instrumentation,'' TS 3/4.3.2, ''Containment and Reactor Vessel Isolation Control System,'' TS 3/4.3.3, ''Emergency Core Cooling System Actuation Instrumentation,'' TS 3/4.3.4.2, ''End-of-Cycle Recirculation Pump Trip System Instrumentation,'' TS 3/4.3.5, ''Reactor Core Isolation Cooling System Actuation Instrumentation,'' TS 3/4.4.2.1, ''Safety/Relief Valves,'' and TS 3/4.4.2.2, ''Safety/Relief Valves Low-Low Set Functions.'' These TS contain requirements to perform manual testing of the associated solid state logic at least once every four fuel cycles on a staggered basis. This testing is in addition to the automatic testing performed by the self-test system. This amendment removes the requirement to perform manual testing of the solid state logic when the automatic testing is already performed.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of January 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Jack W. Roe,**

*Director, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 95–2574 Filed 2–1–95; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590–01–M**